

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****MAR 19 2007****FAX TRANSMISSION****DATE:**

3/19/07

**PTO IDENTIFIER:** Application Number 10/784,898-Conf. #1032

Patent Number

**Inventor:** Thomas BRINKMAN et al.**MESSAGE TO:** US Patent and Trademark Office**FAX NUMBER:** (571) 273-8300**FROM:** WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP

Irah H. Donner

**PHONE:** (212) 230-8800**Attorney Dkt. #:** 0103864.00100US2**PAGES (Including Cover Sheet):** 6**CONTENTS:**Part B - Fee Transmittal - Issue Fee (1 page)  
Response to Reasons for Allowance (3 pages)  
Certificate of Transmission (1 page)

If your receipt of this transmission is in error, please notify this firm immediately by collect call to sender at (212) 230-8800 and send the original transmission to us by return mail at the address below.

This transmission is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or duplication of this transmission by someone other than the intended addressee or its designated agent is strictly prohibited.

**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP**  
399 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022  
**Telephone:** (212) 230-8800 **Facsimile:** (212) 230-8888

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

P1023897 (05-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.


Application No. (if known): 10/784,808

Attorney Docket No.: 0103864.00100US2

**Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

on 3/19/07  
Date



Signature

Ira H. Donner

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

35,120  
Registration Number, if applicable

(212) 230-8800  
Telephone Number

Note. Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Part B - Fee Transmittal - Issue Fee (1 page)  
Response to Reasons for Allowance (3 pages)

Docket No.: 103864.100 US2

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

PATENT/OFFICIAL

**MAR 19 2007****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application No.	10/784,898	Art Unit:	3694
Applicant(s):	Thomas Brinkman et al.	Examiner:	Susanna M. Meinecke Diaz
Date Filed:	February 24, 2004	Conf. No.	1032
Docket No.	103864.100 US2	Cust. No.	28089

Title: **COMPUTER IMPLEMENTED MEDICAL INTEGRATED  
DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Sir:

Applicant substantially agrees with the Examiner's reasons for allowance in the Office Action, subject to the comments herein. Applicant would like to emphasize, and assumes that the Examiner intended to so state, that the combination of elements in each of the allowed claims, independent and dependent, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art when each claim is interpreted as a whole.

Applicant provides no opinion with respect to interpreting the references cited by the Examiner, and therefore, does not concede to the Examiner's interpretation of same, as permitted under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.104(e), particularly since the Examiner does not respond to an Applicant's Response to Reasons for Allowance. Applicant would like to clarify that the only interpretation that Applicant will accept or agrees with is the interpretation one of ordinary skill in the art would understand from the prior art references.

Applicant strongly emphasizes that one reviewing the prosecution history should not interpret any of the examples Applicant has described herein in connection with distinguishing

Docket No.: 103864.100 US2

PATENT/OFFICIAL

over the prior art as limiting to those specific features in isolation. Rather, Applicant asserts that it is the combination of elements recited in each of the claims, when each claim is interpreted as a whole, which is patentable. Applicant has emphasized certain features in the claims as clearly not present in the cited references, as discussed above. However, Applicant does not concede that other features in the claims are found in the prior art. Rather, for the sake of simplicity, Applicant is providing examples of why the claims described above are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Applicant wishes to clarify for the record, if necessary, that the claims have been amended to expedite prosecution. Moreover, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original subject matter recited in the present claims in a continuation application.

Further, Applicant hereby retracts any arguments and/or statements made during prosecution that were rejected by the Examiner during prosecution and/or that were unnecessary to obtain allowance, and only maintains the arguments that persuaded the Examiner with respect to the allowability of the patent claims, as one of ordinary skill would understand from a review of the prosecution history. That is, Applicant specifically retracts statements that one of ordinary skill would recognize from reading the file history were not necessary, not used and/or were rejected by the Examiner in allowing the patent application.

Any narrowing amendments made to the claims in the present Amendment are not to be construed as a surrender of any subject matter between the original claims and the present claims; rather merely Applicant's best attempt at providing one or more definitions of what the Applicant believes to be suitable patent protection. In addition, the present claims provide the intended scope of protection that Applicant is seeking for this application. Therefore, no

Docket No.: 103864.100 US2


PATENT/OFFICIAL

estoppel should be presumed, and Applicant's claims are intended to include a scope of protection under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Any claim cancellations and/or cancelled subject matter have been done without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicant does not disclaim any subject matter in any of the embodiments of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP



Irah H. Donner  
Registration No. 35,120

399 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
TEL (212) 230-8887  
FAX (212) 230-8888

Date: 3/19/07